THE GOTHIC CATHEDRAL*

WILLIAM NIGEL KERR

Gustav-Adolf Gedat in his book *They Built for Eternity,*[1] has once again shown us the significant place of architecture within diverse historico-geographical cultural areas. When a man sets his hand to erect in metal, stone or wood a monument, a resting place for his body, or more significantly, a temple where his god will dwell or where he will worship his god, that man uncovers the heart of all that he believes and all that he is. This remains true whether the locus be Ur of the Chaldees, Karnak, Toltec, Peking, Athens, Londinium or a modern American city.

It is also to be noted that architecture is a legitimate means of religious expression and as such takes its place with music, sculpture, painting etc. What is to be said in words can validly be said in other media as well and with telling effect. The builder writes in large letters on the edifice his concept of himself and his fellows, his understanding of life, and places with these an imprint of the god-image which overshadows him. It follows from this that no age can fully be understood apart from its buildings and this is most strikingly seen in the high Middle Ages.

The "Gothic miracle" came as the crowning achievement of an orderly process which had been under way for centuries. It must be viewed as the final stage of an endeavor begun shortly after the age of Constantine. As such, it is the pinnacle of careful architectural advance and not "a momentary incandescence of spirit."[2]

The Gothic builders made good use of the accumulated knowledge of those who raised the churches of former days. Charlemagne and other church building rulers of northern Europe called men to their side who knew how to put up structures of stone. With this the wooden buildings of the older Roman style were largely replaced by what was in part Byzantine. This early Byzantine influence, however, though not to be easily dismissed, gives away in turn to "a logical and independent development"[3] which took as its point of departure certain structural features quite purely Roman. The virile Germanic peoples of the north then originated a stream of build-

1. Gedat, Gustav-Adolf, *They Built for Eternity,* New York: Abingdon-Cokesbury Press, 1953.
2. Bailey, A. E., *The Arts and Religion,* New York: The Macmillan Co., 1944, p. 72.
3. Thompson & Johnson, *An Introduction to Medieval Europe,* New York: W. W. Norton & Co., 1937, p. 804.

*This paper was originally read before the annual meeting of The Society of Phi Alpha Chi, the Scholastic Honor Society of Gordon College and Gordon Divinity School, on June 4, 1956.

This journal is not an official publication of Gordon College or Gordon Divinity School. It is rather an independent effort sponsored by the persons whose names are listed as comprising the official staff of the publication. The school and editorial staff take no responsibility for the individual opinions expressed herein.

THE WARREN PRESS, INC.
Boston, Massachusetts

THE GORDON REVIEW

VOL. II NO. 3 SEPTEMBER, 1956

Editor
LLOYD F. DEAN

Assistant Editors
DAVID L. FRANZ
CHARLES A. HUTTAR
PHILIP C. JOHNSON
C. MILBURN KEEN, JR.
WILLIAM N. KERR
DONALD F. TWEEDIE, JR.

Business Manager
THOMAS H. LEITH

Subscription Rates

Single Copy	$ .75
1 year	2.00

Address all correspondence to:

GORDON REVIEW
Beverly Farms, Mass.

Contents

The Gothic Cathedral
William Nigel Kerr 87

Cosmic Time
Gordon H. Clark 94

Christian Faith and Mental Health
Leonard C. Vander Linde, Jr. 99

True Ecumenicity — II
Jules Marcel Nicole 102

A Reply to "The Gospel Song"
John Beauregard 106

Personalia 108

REVIEWS OF BOOKS

PIKE *et al* MODERN CANTERBURY PILGRIMS
Charles A. Huttar 109

GREEN SOVEREIGN GRACE BOOK CLUB

VAN TIL THE DEFENSE OF THE FAITH
CHRISTIANITY AND IDEALISM
Thomas H. Leith 111

PARROT THE FLOOD AND NOAH'S ARK
THE TOWER OF BABEL

METZGER ST. PAUL'S JOURNEYS

WILLIAMS THE PROPHETS
Philip C. Johnson 113

THOMAS THE AMERICAN CATHOLIC FAMILY
Emmet Russell 115

MILLER EDUCATION FOR CHRISTIAN LIVING

MUNRO PROTESTANT NURTURE
Charles G. Schauffele 118

SURVEY OF SIGNIFICANT ARTICLES 122
Thomas H. Leith

The GORDON REVIEW is published quarterly by members of the Gordon Faculties.
Printed in U.S.A.

ing called Romanesque which was constantly modified by techniques adopted along the way and which merged into the Gothic, no clear line being discernable between the two. Some authorities prefer to "speak simply of the gradual perfection of Christian architecture."[4] At any rate by the opening of the second Christian millenium northern Europe had shaken itself almost entirely free of Byzantine dominance and was well on its way to independent development.

The Romanesque architect began by abandoning the flat wooden roof of older times which was neither beautiful nor safe. In its place he constructed the semi-circular arched stone roof which initiated the heavenward reach but which necessitated tremendous walls and buttresses to support the horizontal thrust of the vault. To prevent a weakening of the great walls only small pointed windows were used. The extensive wall spaces were highly decorated with imaginative use of color — red, blue, and gold in mosaics, frescoes, painted statuary and mouldings. The effect of this color was often diminished since the windows admitted but little light. The Romanesque proper was then generally quite drab, dark, and gloomy — its outstanding feature being its massiveness. From the exterior one might almost think that the structure was solid stone and above all the impression of a stolid permanence is conveyed. With construction of the Pilgrim churches such as Santiago de Compostela the Romanesque was stretched to the limit of its possibilities and new forms were sought.[5]

The years 1125 to 1140 have been termed the most astonishing in architectural history for during this period Gothic style was fully, firmly and finally developed.[6] In the nave of Bury cathedral, begun in 1125, the pointed arch was employed, the ribs of the oblong vault supporting the weight of the roof. This departure was employed with timidity and perhaps without a full understanding of its import, but nevertheless, the clear determination of the architect is evident. Others were not slow to see the value of the new style and at St. Germer de Fly all the effects of Bury were used with confidence, in addition to which there is an articulation of shafting and a new "loftyness of line and grace of proportion."[7] The builders, however, still hid the buttresses beneath a roof and though they reduced the clerestory wall to Gothic proportion it remained blank with only small windows to break the surface. Within, the dynamic of Gothic was active but outwardly it remained sturdy Norman so that one must turn to

4. Ibid., p. 805.
5. Bailey, A. E., *Op. Cit,* p. 84-85.
6. Cramm, R. A., *The Substance of Gothic,* Boston: Marshall Jones Co., 1938, p. 123.
7. *Loc. cit.*

the Abbey of St. Denis, consecrated 1140, to discover the true Gothic. St. Denis was followed by Sens, Noyon, Paris and Laon in rapid succession.

Bury and St. Germer de Fly were, then, the last of the Norman style but in them are to be seen rapid strides toward true Gothic.[8] At St. Denis the line is fully crossed and the heritage destined to rule Church architecture for centuries established. The builders of Lombardy and Normandy invented the structural elements but left it to the creative hands of a rising generation of architects "to transform a casual assembling into coherency, and transfigure it with a new spirit of unexampled power and of beauty unapproachable."[9]

From our perspective it can be seen that Romanesque and Gothic did not differ from one another in features commonly thought to be Gothic, for the late Romanesque also employed the pointed arch, ribbed vaulting, clustered pillars, and flying buttresses. The difference is more basic, it lies in the way these features are employed. The Romanesque used them decoratively while in the Gothic they were an integral part of the structure, as necessary as bones in the human body and as significant in giving the exterior its form. The Gothic used arch, rib, pillar, and buttress to transmit the weight of the building to the ground and at the same time the eye and soul of the worshipper to sky.

The Gothic was erected on a principle of balance in which each part was functionally related to each other part in order to secure an equilibrium of thrust. Each stone is held in place only by its relation to other stones. The walls will not stand without the buttress and the buttresses rely upon pinnacles and flying buttresses. All was "so carefully and cleverly balanced that a fault in a stone might cause a wall or even the entire building to collapse."[10]

That essential quality which is termed Gothic has been described in these words: cohesion, economy and character.[11] By 'cohesion' is meant that all factors were knit together synthetically resulting in a dynamic power which flows outward from within under the influence of a single unifying law, making 'structure' in itself efficient and beautiful. All ornamentation grew eventually from the unifying foundational impulse so that it is something inevitable and not 'added.'

The term 'economy' indicates that the mechanical forces are employed in such a way that they work either together or in intelligent opposition.

8. Robb, D. M., *Art in the Western World,* New York: Harper Bos., 1942, p. 157.
9. Cramm, R. A., *Op. cit.,* p. 127.
10. Dudley, Louise & Farecy, Austin, *The Humanities,* New York: McGraw-Hill Book Co., 1951, p. 425.
11. Cramm, R. A., *Op. cit.,* p. 137.

Thus it is possible to reduce the use of walls, arches, buttresses and vaults to a logical minimum though always mindful of the 'optical minimum' beyond which point the eye would not be satisfied even if structurally a further reduction were possible.

By 'character' is meant that final something which makes a thing Gothic and this is most difficult to define. It is that which the glass of Chartes, the sculpture of Amiens, the pictures of Giotto, the Hora Novissima have in common. That which each possesses which makes them of one cloth materially and spiritually, that of Medieval thought and custom which interpenetrates them all is Gothic. Henry Adams in viewing the remains of an arch noted that while you can hammer the Gothic to pieces you cannot hammer the Gothic out of it.[12]

Many structures give the impression of being 'as solid as a statue' with no feeling at all of their interior or at best intimating that the interior does not matter. The Gothic Cathedral is not of this nature but magnetically draws the viewer within. Greek temples like the Parthenon are among the former class. One could stand outside and view the complete, calm, hard, bright exterior and feel that the entire message was almost instantaneously revealed. One cannot read off the entire Gothic sermon from afar, but like a book with an attractive cover there is the arousal of interest which leads to further investigation.

Whether inside or outside the Gothic cathedral, the emphasis is vertical rather than horizontal. The vaulting seems to originate at the very foundation and gradually sweep upward until it appears to vanish in the indefinite regions of the peak of the arch. The attention is focused on the nave with its mystical 'heavenward leaping movement.' The nave of Notre-Dame (1205) rises with airy grace 107 feet from floor to crown. Chartres (1194) ascends 120 feet. Beauvais (1325) soars breathtakingly to 157 feet, the awe-inspiring verticality being most evident at the sanctuary. The viewer standing in the nave of such structures is not conscious of dimension for the combination of light, perspective, color and acoustics are not an end in themselves.[13] The visitor is moved by the sense, even the emotion, of space. The mind of Medieval man and his awareness of the infinite nature of God and of eternity pervades the place.

> The intimations of Gothic buildings then, are not chiefly intellectual, though its structural character is logically above all others; nor chiefly practical, though its structural principle is active and never passive; but emotional and mystical. The long and narrow spaces do not spread

12. Adams, Henry, *Mont-Saint-Michel & Chartes,* New York: Houghton Mifflin Co.
13. Bailey, A. E., *Op. cit.,* p. 87.

> out to comprehend a many-sided experience, but point the attention, with a singleness of concentration, upon the highest experience: the high vaulted aisles do not rest assuredly upon the finite and the known, but lead the imagination to find some communion with the infinite unknown.[14]

This characteristic structural consciousness of infinitude of space is supplemented by the use of light. The later Romanesque architect endeavored to bring more light into his church but the very nature of the building and its message of massiveness was against him. It was not so with the Gothic for the concentration of the weight of the roof on a few points using ribbed vaulting made it possible to remove the stone of the walls entirely. The walls of glass became one with the soaring masonary in creation of worshipful surroundings, so that "the Gothic church is a soaring glass house held together by a skeletal framework of stone, or a vast vaulted glass cage."[15] The light of the Gothic windows was an essential part of the worshipper's experience and spoke to his mind precisely the same thing as pillar, rib and arch. The light filters through acres of glass descending on the nave as does sunlight through the vari-colored leaves of an autumn wood. The windows are many and large in size, some the size of tennis courts. They are great mosaics of glass which blend in depth and tone the color to suit the exposure. The figures in the walls of glass tell the stories of the Bible but this is a secondary aim for primarily it is the atmosphere which they create that matters; "the impression of unbounded and infinite space." Among the most striking examples of this is Chartres whose windows contained some of the most magnificent and yet delicate colors ever created by man. As the Byzantine, the late medieval architect understood the use of light and used it as one of his materials.[16]

Perhaps the most striking of the Gothic windows are the roses, the story of which is well told by Allan Temko in his recent work, *Notre-Dame of Paris*. At Paris about 1250, Jehan De Chelles began work on the famous roses in the trancepts. He first shored up the building carefully with heavy timber [in 1730 at a restoration this was not done and the whole facade fell to ruin]. Then with globes, pinnacles, fleurons, crockets ,and spurs he sent the wall 'rocketing upward like pyrotechnics.' Suddenly the wall turns to glass — 2,500 square feet of glass held in a tense rectangle. It is suspended in a net, a stone frame, the thinest strands of which can scarcely be seen. Both the northern and southern roses are 43 feet in diameter, the largest open rose windows ever constructed.

14. Vogt, H., *Art & Religion,* Chicago: University of Chicago, 1935, p. 189.
15. Thompson & Johnson, *Op. cit.,* p. 819.
16. Bailey, A. E., *Op. cit.,* p. 79.

Henri Facillon whose work deals with the structure of the Cathedral of Paris metaphysically, as others have done with the literature of Dante, writes:

> The vanished wall has made way for wheels of fire . . . Yet they are the expression of an idea which seeks equilibrium in the active relation of its parts: all is at work here, all is combined to satisfy the eye and the mind at the same time. All is tensed in order to act . . . Archictecture as an organization of forces, in bewitching form, has finally replaced an archictecture of heavy matter. But it is precisely in this triumph that the danger resides. Architecture should have weight, and even impose evidence of its weight upon us, without crushing us with it. The correct limit of solids and voids has been broken through. Wherever glass can empty the wall and color the light, the wall disappears . . . This is the last phase of the evolution.[17]

As with all art the latter point was eventually reached when style became an end in itself since the major problems were solved and refinements presented the only novel field of exploration. Temko has shown from his research that 13th century architects studied one anothers art with keen interest and kept notebooks in which they compiled details from their own masterpieces.[18] Many of their favorite details drifted into a common pool of knowledge and became the property of all. This was parallel to the theological picture of the late Middle Ages when the scholastics felt fit only to make refinements of Aquinas and Aristotle.

Between the Greek and the Gothic there is a vast difference as has been noted in the contrast between the Greek temple and the Gothic cathedral. Each in a sense speaks of balance and completeness and each points to an objective reality which gives meaning to the experience of the senses, but the Greek finds that reality to be this-worldly while the Gothic says that it is other-worldly. Medieval man saw reality only in those objective characteristics which were parts of a great system, that system being the symbol of transcendant reality. The Gothic Cathedral bespeaks system and has thus been called 'scholasticism in stone' while the framework frequently calls forth comparisons with the *Summa Theologica,* both in perfection of design and austerity. Yet it must be remembered that this is the age which saw the birth of evangelical and speculative mysticism in Northern Europe, and there is something of the mystical in the Gothic cathedral. Here those who could not or did not care to understand the subtleties of scholasticism could find escape some in a heart-warming experience religiously, or perhaps esthetically.

Gothic is essentially 'romantic' as opposed to classic or realistic.

> One can never see the whole, but vistas like that in the corner of Chartres open up, and these are always changing as the light changes. It is a mystery in light and dark, an experience of unlimited space, and it is of the essence of romanticism.[19]

17. Temko, Allan, *Notre-Dame of Paris,* New York: Viking Press, 1955, pp. 237ff.
18. *Ibid.,* p. 240.
19. Dudley, L., & Farecy, A., *Op. cit.,* p. 424.

With romanticism is seen a new naturalism, evident in the striving for beauty of form. The figures lose their block-like typing and become individuals. This was symbolic of the conflict of spiritual values and natural values in the theological realm. The increased naturalism paralleled the growth of nominalism at the end of the 13th century.. "The religious values suggested by church doctrine are more and more transformed into the subjective element of individual piety, of spiritual mood."[20]

The Romanesque are generally said to be the churches of monastaries and that is in part true, but this cannot be said of the Gothic for they were the result of the efforts of a town or city and built under the patronage of rulers or guilds rather than abbotts. This corporate effort of large lay groups was marked by the coming of age of medieval Europe, the arrival at "the second of the great and comprehensive human attitudes in the history of the Western world."[21] Then it was that there emerged a new "social and devotional spirit engendered by a peculiar, beneficent and dynamic energy in the world of the west."[22] It was a socio-religious effort that created the Gothic masterpiece for the effort was not isolated from the organic heart of the people as the pyramids built by the labor of slaves. The extent of building makes abundantly evident the synthesis of the political, social and religious factors in the Middle Ages. The French in the century following 1170 built no less than 80 cathedrals as well as 500 large churches of cathedral size. The building disease, *morbus aedificandi,* resulted in the phenomena of the cart cult described so graphically by a Norman abbott in a letter to the monks of Tutbury in England.

> Who has ever seen or heard the like? Princes, powerful and wealthy men, men of noble birth, proud and beautiful women, bent their necks to the yoke of the carts which carried stones, wood, wine, corn, oil, lime, everything necessary for the church and the support of those working at it. One saw as many as a thousand people, men and women, attached to the reins drawing a wagon so heavy was its burden and a profound silence reigned among the crowd pressing forward with difficulty in the emotion which filled their hearts.[23]

An archbishop of the 11th century similarly wrote of the construction of the cathedral of Chartres:

> The inhabitants of Chartres have combined to aid in the construction of their church by transporting the materials . . . They elect a chief under whose direction they conduct their wagons in silence and with humility . . . They march in such silence that not a murmur is heard . . . when they halt on the road nothing is heard but confession of sins and pure and suppliant prayer. When they have reached the church they arrange the wagons about it like a spiritual camp, and during the whole night they celebrate the watch by hymns and canticles.[24]

20. Bosenbrook & Johannesen, *Foundations of Western Civilization,* Ann Arbor: Wayne University, 1936.
21. Robb, D. M., *Op. cit.,* p. 154.
22. Cramm, R. A., *Op. cit.,* p. 122.
23. Thompson & Johnson, *Op. cit.,* p. 808.

This is the Gothic cathedral called so in scorn by Italian architects. A style which continued until it became what many feel to be the highest achievement of man in church architecture, far surpassing the over-ornate Renaissance product of its critics. It was dependent on the past: the skill of the Byzantine, the experiments of the Romanesque, the power of the Christianized barbarians. It partook of the contemporary: called forth by popular piety aroused by the mendicant orders, assisted to its meaning by the new learning, finding support in the rise of towns and economic advance. What Aquinas put in words for the few the church builders put in stone for the many.

The Gothic cathedral was more, however, than 'petrified scholasticism. Its groping vaults demanded supreme confidence from its builders and gave them in return solace for hearts seeking expression they found in no contemporary institution.

One could find much ground to criticize the Gothic since it is so closely connected with a theological system which leaves much to be desired. It has even been said that it "was too literate, to rational in its endless search for the irrational."[25] Setting all this aside, however, it is difficult to stand in the nave of one of these great churches, feeling the soul-lifting thrust of its stones, experiencing the blended light flooding through its windows bringing life to its austere interior, and not feel drawn to God. Admittedly the experience may be one of the enjoyment of beauty but it can be much more, for within the glorious casements the transcendant becomes immanent.

The Gothic Cathedral must have been in the mind of Emerson as he spoke of

> The gray old temples of faith and prayer, mountains of stone uplifted by human love and hope, which nature has adopted in the race and given an equal date with Andes and Ararat.

COSMIC TIME:

A Critique of the Concept in Herman Dooyeweerd

Gordon H. Clark

Now that the English translation of *A New Critique of Theoretical Thought* (Philadelphia: The Presbyterian and Reformed Publishing Co., 1955) by Professor Herman Dooyeweerd of the Free University of Amsterdam has begun to appear, a more wide-spread discussion of his views is bound to take place in evangelical circles. Pierre Marcel in France and

24. Bosenbrook & Johannesen, *Op. cit.*, p. 269.
25. Temko, A., *Op. cit.*, p. 36.

Professor Cornelius Van Til in America, and others as well, have received Dooyeweerd's philosophy with hearty applause. At the same time, the two volumes now translated (I—566 pp. II—598 pp. $36.00 the set of 4 vols.) make rather difficult reading, and the author in the Preface encourages and warns us to procede slowly and to work step by step. This paper will consider one of the first steps, the problem of time.

Dooyeweerd says:

> The intent of philosophy is to give us a theoretical insight into the coherence of our temporal world as an intermodal coherence of meaning . . . . It is a temporal coherence . . . . Within this temporal coherence reality displays a great diversity of modal aspects [such as] the aspects of number, space motion, energy . . . . the economic, aesthetic, jural, moral, and faith aspects . . . . All these modal aspects are interwoven with one another in a cosmic order of time (1-24).

Since a few pages later Dooyeweerd says that "the idea of cosmic time constitutes the basis of the philosophical theory of reality in this book" and "by virtue of its integral character it may be called new" (28), it follows that this new and basic concept should be examined with care.

In order to define cosmic time he begins by asserting that "time-order is necessarily related to factual duration" (24). On the surface this seems too obvious to need mention. The duration of a plant, a planet, or a nation is surely related to the order of past, present, and future hours and years. But out of this hardly surprising remark Dooyeweerd gets the definition of his basic concept — cosmic time. "Only this indissoluble correlation of order and duration can be called cosmic time" (24). This is repeated and clarified:

> Time in its cosmic sense has a cosmonomic and a factual side. Its cosmonomic side is the temporal order of succession or simultaneity. The factual side is the factual duration, which differs with various individualities (28).

Concerning this definition of cosmic time two points must be made. First, it will be necessary to observe whether Dooyeweerd's use of the phrase cosmic time invariably conforms to this definition, or whether he alters the sense so that the concept becomes ambiguous. Second, we must ask whether or not the words of the definition convey a definite meaning. Are the two sentences, the obvious remark and the definition proper, sufficient and complete? That is to say, if time-order is one kind of time and time-duration another kind of time, and if neither time itself, nor order, nor duration is anywhere defined, has any specific meaning been determined for a third kind of time, cosmic time? Or, again, if we evade the very difficult problem of defining time, and plunge boldly into talking about order and duration, is it clear that a relation between the two is in any sense time? A rose bush may live several years. Is the relation between this duration and the "time-order" (the succession of moments?) properly called time? One would naturally be

inclined to think that the time order itself is time, the duration being a part of time, and the relation of the part to the whole not time at all. If these confusions are to be found in the basic concept of Dooyeweerd's philosophy, it will be difficult to find much meaning in the sequel.

Part of the sequel is this. Dooyeweerd offers some criticism of the theories of time of the Ionians, Albertus Magnus, Thomas Aquinas, St. Augustine, Kant, Einstein, and Bergson. In all these theories it strikes him again and again that time has been unwittingly identified with one of its modal aspects. "Consequently," he concludes, "the opposition between rationalistic and irrationalistic conceptions has lost its foundation for us" (28). In view of the defectvie character of his definition, however, this conclusion lacks adequate premises.

No further criticism need be made of the immediately following subtitle: "All structures of temporal reality are structures of cosmic time" (29). If cosmic time is indeed time, it is pure tautology to say that all temporal reality is temporal. The trouble lies precisely in the concept of cosmic time. Or, better, there is no concept of cosmic time.

> We can form a theoretical concept of the separate modal aspects of time. But time itself, in all its embracing cosmic meaning can never be comprehended in a concept, because the former alone [the aspects, or time itself: which?] makes the concept possible (30).

Time of course has caused philosophers no end of trouble. Besides the old Eleatic dilemmas, Plato had no satisfactory view of time, St. Augustine was visibly embarrassed, and Aristotle and Aquinas cannot be accepted with much enthusiasm. Small wonder therefore that Bergson gave up in despair and adopted an irrationalism. However, to admit an irrationalism in one place prevents its exclusion anywhere else. Now, Kant too denied that time is a concept, and so is superficially comparable with Dooyeweerd. But, Kant said positively that time is an intuition; and even if one does not care to follow Kant, one must recognize at least that Kant has spoken more definitely and more understandably than Dooyeweerd.

Difficult as a theory of time admittedly is, one may still be able to state what time is not. If anything is clear, it should be that logical order is not to be identified with temporal order. Yet Dooyeweerd identifies them. At least he says,

> The logical order of simultaneity and of prius and posterius is as much a modal aspect of the integral order of time as the physical . . . . Therefore it is meaningless to set the logical prius and posterius in opposition to the temporal before and after (30).

Physical motion may well be a modal aspect of temporal order, but that logical order cannot be temporal is supported by the following consideration. A given plant must begin with the germination of the seed and can

bloom only afterward: it never blooms first and germinates afterward. But a syllogism can be stated either with its premises first or with its conclusion first, without detriment to its validity.

Now, Dooyeweerd notices this fact and gives a very lame reply. In what is apparently an effort to make the temporal order of the syllogism irreversible he asserts that "it is not to be doubted that it [the syllogism] does so [proceeds from premise to conclusion] when we draw a syllogistic inference in theoretical logical form (30). Naturally! But all this means is that when we state the premises first, we state the conclusion last. This triviality is no answer to the fact that the validity of the syllogism does not depend on the temporal order of our stating it, and that we can state it in some other order. We can even state one premise, then the conclusion, and finally the second premise. The logical order remains the same in all these different temporal orders. Therefore the two orders are not to be identified Conversely, although a syllogism can be temporally rearranged, the growth and blooming of a plant cannot.

Dooyeweerd continues by making geometry and arithemtic aspects of time. Space, he says, is not supratemporal because it exists simultaneously. We shall not here raise the question of what space is, though a definition of space ought to precede the conclusion that space is a mode of time. But when Dooyeweerd makes arithmetic a mode of time, he can at least appeal to the authority of Kant. He can and he does. A contrary view "would even spell a regress in the face of the view of Kant, who made number originate from a schematizing of the logical category of quantity in time" (32).

Aside from the fact that it is strange to appeal to Kant as an authority in the construction of a Christian philosophy, the point to which the appeal is made enmeshes us in difficulty. Kant's connection between arithmetic and time is puzzling. In one place he states that arithmetic is the science of time as geometry is the science of space; but far from carrying through with such a definite statement, in every other reference he speaks more vaguely One may note that the numbers of arithmetic are discontinuous, while time is a continuum. Perhaps a better case could be made out for calculus. In any case, Dooyeweerd is open to criticism in making arithmetic and geometry aspects of time on the ground that space exists simultaneously. The fact that something exists in time does not make it a mode of time.

Something more easily grasped comes next. Dooyeweerd asserts that, however it might be with space and number, man transcends temporal coherence (24). The religious center of human existence transcends time (31), though the central sphere of human existence is dynamic. Out of this the dramatic conflict between the City of God and the earthly city takes its issue in history.

> "We can even call it the central sphere of occurrence, for that which occurs cannot be distinguished too sharply from the historical aspect of cosmic time, which is only one of its temporal modalities of meaning" (32).

Is this assertion intelligible? First, let us omit the word cosmic. Then the statement would say that the sphere of occurrences or even the occurrences themselves must be sharply distinguished from history. It is difficult to know what this could mean. Second, let us replace the word cosmic and refer back to the definition. Cosmic time is the relationship between time order and time duration. This *relationship* has an historical aspect. Occurrences then are to be sharply distinguished from the historical relationship between time order and time succession. This latter and fuller expression seems no more intelligible than the former. If that which occurs is not historical, what can history be?

To this point the criticism of Dooyeweerd's views has moved within the sphere of conventional philosophical analysis; but the following quotation suggests a question that is more properly called theological. Dooyeweerd writes:

> To be sure, cosmic time has its limiting aspect in faith and there is a temporal order and duration in the special meaning of the latter. The modal meaning of faith, as we shall see in the second volume, is by its nature related to divine revelation. In this eschatalogical aspect of time faith groups [grasps?] the "eschaton" and, in general, that which is or happens beyond the limits of cosmic time. In this special sense are to be understood the "days of creation," the initial words of the book of Genesis, the order in which regeneration *precedes* conversion etc.
> Theology will always need this limiting aspect of time in which the cosmic temporal order is indissolubly connected with the revealed supra-temporal realm. However, I cannot agree with the tendency of some modern Christian theologians, who identify the eschatalogical aspect of time with the historical and reject the supra-temporal central sphere of human existence and of divine revelation (33).

Here Dooyeweerd teaches that in the sphere of faith time takes on a special meaning. There is an eschatalogical aspect of time which grasps that which happens *beyond the limits of cosmic time.* As an example of what happens beyond the limits of cosmic time, he mentions the creative days of Genesis. This eschatalogical aspect of time cannot be identified with historical time.

Now, in view of the neo-orthodox antithesis between time and eternity, in view of paradox and supra-temporal contemporaneity, and in view of the reduction of the Biblical events to symbols and myths, Dooyeweerd's language is disturbing. Perhaps in the volumes yet to be published, he will strongly emphasize the verbal inerrancy of the Scriptures. Surely it is to be hoped that he will not neglect this subject. But until he stresses verbal inspiration, and possibly afterward too, one must ask what is really meant by denying that the first chapter of Genesis is historical. If any part of the Biblical events

are beyond the limits of cosmic time — that is to say, in the light of the analysis in the first part of this paper, if some events did not occur in time — how does one decide which of the Biblical accounts are historical and which are not? If the six days of creation are not temporal, is the serpent's temptation of Eve historical? And is the crucifixion historical? What is the criterion by which one may distinguish an event that really occurred in time from some revelational, supra-temporal symbol?

Dooyeweerd, though he may not intend the same meaning, uses some of the language of the neo-orthodox. And one wonders whether it is possible on his construction to maintain the factual truth of Biblical history.

Thus, we may conclude that both theologically and philosophically Dooyeweerd's view of time in its present form is, at very least, inadequate.

CHRISTIAN FAITH AND MENTAL HEALTH—I

The Magic of Faith

Leonard C. Vander Linde, Jr.

Christian faith is not a magic formula for mental health.. Such a statement stands in sharp contrast to the direct and implied promises which emanate from so many pulpits today. The spate of pot-boilers whether written by lay Christians or clergy all seem intent on proving that faith and "adjustment" are necessary blood-brothers. The extent of the appeal to the public mind contained in the equating of faith and mental health, serenity, peace of mind, soul, or what-have-you is perhaps most emphasized by its use as a cardinal "selling point" of many contemporary evangelists.

If the present tendency to overplay the psychological utility of faith existed only among the more extreme groups, such a tendency could be readily dismissed as unfortunate, but of little concern to the general Christian community. It is, however, the widespread character of this phenomenon and its appearance among even orthodox Christians that makes a discussion of the matter highly relevant. By way of illustrating this point, one can listen to the regular radio or television programs of Norman Vincent Peale to feel the impact of a faith-works-for-you approach. The combination of salesmanship, pragmatism with a revivalists' vocabulary, and case history testimonial used by Dr. Peale has won for his position an ever-widening, sympathetic audience. Such a this-worldly approach communicated on the level of simple statement and coupled with a guaranteed method makes the more traditional exposition of Christian faith seem pale and sickly by comparison. Who among us does not feel a tug of longing and perhaps even a surge of personal power when we hear eminent clergymen

such as Dr. Peale confidently assert that our faith not only makes us whole, but also aids us in conquering all life circumstances. To hear that our faith in God, if we will only assert it positively, automatically ushers in a flood of good things, an inescapable series of by-products such as health, happiness, normal personality development, vitality, strength, beauty and the habit of success, is so seductive that only a fool would think of resisting. However, quite apart from the obvious salesmanship in such an approach, which makes the product suspect, the conclusions are invalid psychologically, logically, and, despite the open testimonials, simply do not jibe with real life experience.

This indictment of an attempt to equate Christian faith with inevitable, practical consequences may lead the reader to ask whether faith is then completely divorced from practical consequence, in this case mental health? Is there no effectiveness in faith as it generalizes through the behavior of the whole man? After all, one might protest, faith without some verifying works, some observable consequences is a frightfully barren concept. Obviously some relationship does exist or the meaning of the statement "Ye shall know them by their fruits" is incomprehensible. Also, the process of living is largely governed by attitudes, and the faith by which we live determines the way we live.

Granting the merit of this argument does not establish the precise meaning or more importantly the particular and invariant relationship between faith and action, profession of principle and life behavior. Naturally, faith without action is divorced from the real world because it is sterile; just as action without faith would be meaningless, random, and inarticulate. While affirming that sincere Christian faith can and should affect one's actions in a positive manner, I wish to refute the current notion that faith is automatically efficacious. It is in this more specific sense that the words 'no magic in faith' are used.

Those who see faith as the complete answer to the achieving of mental health often have as a basic assumption the equation: illness equals sin. Thus, in the case of maladjustment or more severe mental problems such people attribute the cause to bad thinking or bad feelings, which are regarded as sinful processes. Consequently, it seems self-evident that to think rightly, positively, would correct the condition. While mental illness may be a part of the consequences of Sin, each individual case is certainly not to be attributed to a particular sin of the person in question. Jesus took the trouble in His day to correct the people concerning the näiveté and oversimplification involved in such an idea. The psychological tendency in all of us to consider any illness, misfortune or unpleasant event as a punishment is an easily observed phenomenon. Such attitudes are emphasized in the training

of children, especially in the homes of the more pious. But, if the relationship were such a direct chain of cause and effect, then obviously the more seriously ill would be those with the greatest sin or least faith. On a common sense level we would and do reject this notion as absurd or nonsense.

Another aspect of the problem is that one cannot assume that Christian faith as variously interpreted even among the orthodox is a unitary phenomenon. From a psychological standpoint the nature of the object of one's devotion and the attendant frame of orientation often exhibit a marked polarity of definition in the Christian community. God as the object of faith is seen as entitled to obedience, worship, and reverence by virtue of selective emphases on such disparate attributes as His power or His love. While logically these attributes need not be separated, a different emphasis leads to markedly different conclusions and implications. The effect on the psychological functioning of people who interpret their faith in terms of different attributes is amply demonstrated by the history of denominationalism, and at the extremes, cultism in America. On a broader scale, the history of the West is marred by the occurrence of torture, liquidation, repression, and violence by religious authoritarianism in the name of Christ.

One might claim that all of the statements made above are correct, but they do not apply to 'true' Christian faith. I would agree. Surely God was serious when he commanded us to be perfect as He is perfect; when He by entering history through His Son exemplified the reality of perfected manhood. Through faith men are indeed remade as we are given to understand by God's revelation, as we observe it occur among us, and as a personal experience. But, the method by which this is achieved in each person may vary; the degree of change varies; in short, the process is not standardized. The comparative discrepancy which continues to exist between two equally 'true' Christians in such expressive behaviors as meekness, charity, forgiveness, character strength, piety, etc. in no way negates the efficacy of faith. Our faith indeed irrevocably commits us to intend our own perfection, but carries with it no specific promise of equal attainment (as we measure achievements) for all who make a similar commitment. That which we are as personalities when we become Christian differs widely. Some have healthier personality patterns, fewer problems, greater strengths by virtue of providential gift in the form of more benign childhood experiences, fewer life traumas, more stable constitutions, better heredity, more congenial environments, etc. Thus, the 'raw material' is also not standardized. The subsequent temptations which we experience, disease, and other factors will play a significant role in determining the extent to which as individual Christians we attain in time our mandate to be perfect.

(to be continued)

HOLBROOK LIBRARY
PACIFIC SCHOOL
OF RELIGION

TRUE ECUMENICITY — II

CHRISTIAN UNITY: HOW?

JULES MARCEL NICOLE

This question receives in John 17 a particularly detailed answer which we shall summarize under three heads.

A. *Christian unity has God Himself as its prototype.*

One can conceive of many forms of unity: that of an army marching in step, that of a political party with its delicate balancing of divergent views, that of a buzzing beehive. When Jesus prayed that the Father would unite His people, He chose as the propotype of unity that which exists within the Trinity: "That they may be one as we are one" (verse 22). We cannot engage here in a detailed study of the unity of the Father and the Son. We shall, therefore, confine ourselves to a few remarks based principally on the text of the sacerdotal prayer.

The Father and the Son are one in essence since together with the Holy Spirit they are one God: "Thou in me, and I in Thee," says Jesus (v. 21). There is interpenetration there. I have a faint analogy of it when I join my hands: each hand is in the other. Yet there remains this difference that my joined hands can be separated, while the ties which unite the Father and the Son are indissoluble. Our text speaks of unity in glory, that is in external radiation of being: "Glorify Thy Son that Thy Son also may glorify Thee" (v. 1). One and the same glory radiates from both Father and Son. Finally let us mention the fact that the Father and the Son are united by their mutual love (v. 24; cf. John 14: 31).

This is the kind of unity which should exist among the children of God. There is among them a unity of nature. Indwelt by the same Spirit, they form together one being. The comparisons used by Scripture are suggestive: a building whose stones formerly scattered are now solidly cemented together so as to form one whole; a body whose members can live only in their connection with each other, none of them having an independent existence; the bride, that is to say again, one being. In the light of these illustrations we see how intimate and profound Christian unity is intended to be.

The text mentions also our community in glory. Jesus declares: "I am glorified in them. I have given them Thy glory" (v. 10, 22). Too often men quarrel over a vain glory, being filled with jealousy toward one another. Here we are all together showered with infinite glory. Finally, there is love "which is the bond of perfection" (Col. 3: 14), the distinctive mark by which our discipleship is recognized (John 13: 35).

These are the principles, what are the facts of experience? As in all aspects of our Christian experience, we notice a partial realization of God's intentions here and now, and we await a perfect fulfilment when Christ shall come again. Our unity parallels in this, for example, our personal sanctification. From the very time of our conversion we are saints in Christ, separated for Him. But, even though saints, we still have many imperfections. When the Lord shall come we shall be fully like Him. Meanwhile we must follow after sanctification. Similarly, from the moment we are saved, we are one with all our brethren in the faith: we have the same nature, we have the title to the same glory, we love one another. Christian unity does not need to be created, it is there. But as long as we are on the earth, it is imperfect. When Jesus comes again, perfection will be brought to pass, here as elsewhere. The Church shall not have spot, or wrinkle, or any such thing. Until that day, we must indeed lament over the imperfections of our brotherly ties; we must humble ourselves on their account, but we need hardly be surprised at them. Even in the Apostolic age it was so. Sometimes we exaggerate somewhat the qualities of the primitive Church. In the same chapter that Paul speaks of the unity of the Spirit as a grace already received and to be maintained, he speaks also of the unity of faith as a blessing yet future (Eph. 4: 3-13).

For instance, there may be among those who truly belong to Christ certain differences which bear on secondary matters and do not prelude a common walk. Paul says to the Philippians: "If in anything ye be otherwise minded, God shall reveal even this unto you. Nevertheless, whereto we have already attained, let us walk by the same rule, let us mind the same thing" (Phil. 3: 15, 16). It would be inconceivable that the Father and the Son should be "in anything otherwise minded." The unity of the Philippian believers was therefore not yet fully perfected. Yet there was no obstacle to a true understanding.

Sometimes the differences among those who believe in Christ through the Apostles' word can hinder collaboration even when spiritual unity is not jeopardized thereby. Between Paul and Barnabas such a contention arose with respect to John Mark that the two men had to separate for a time (Acts 15: 36-39). Who was wrong? It would be difficult to say. Both were justified by the events which followed. After this separation Paul made what humanly speaking must be called his most fruitful missionary journey. Mark did not betray the confidence which Barabas had placed in him, Paul himself acknowledged it later (2 Tim. 4: 11). It would be blasphemous to image a quarrel between the Father and the Son. Thus even men of God like Paul and Barnabas had not reached perfection with respect to unity. It can happen to us also that we may feel constrained

to refuse to collaborate with a brother, with whom we feel at one spiritually, but whose methods we cannot conscientiously approve. Some people seem to be so obsessed with the thought of Christian unity that they would seem ready to sacrifice even essentials for it, or expect others so to do. This is going too far. We can without fear sacrifice on the altar of brotherly collaboration our tastes and our preferences, but never our convictions. It is better in some cases that each should go his way rather than to stay together and quarrel.

B. *Christian unity has God Himself as its foundation.*

In the sacerdotal prayer believers are not represented as directly united to each other, but rather as united together through the Lord. Jesus said: "Keep *in Thy name* those whom Thou hast given me, that they may be one" (v. 11). The means which He sets forth so that all may be perfectly one is this: "I in them and Thou in Me" (v. 23). He is always the necessary intermediary between us. Christian unity cannot be properly located on the horizontal plane, by means of a multitude of threads which would bind believers to each other. Christian unity is vertical: each believer is related to the Lord, and through Him to other Christians. A servant of God used to say: "Often we labor heavily to build bridges, where it would be better to raise ladders!"

Men often seek to maintain unity by loyalty to a man or to a human institution. This is not at all the pattern presened in the sacerdotal prayer. Believers shall not be one in virtue of their relation to Peter, or to the Apostles, but merely in virtue of their relation to the Lord.

In this respect there is a difference between the Old and the New Covenant. Moses did request God to give to the people an earthly ruler, so that they might not be "as sheep without a shepherd" (Numb. 27: 17). God gave them Joshua, to whom every good Israelite had to remain submitted on penalty of death (Josh. 1: 18). But now the Church does not need an earthly ruler, be it an individual or a group. According to the word of Jeremiah, no one has to teach his brother, saying: "Know the Lord" (Jer. 31: 34).

All this must be for us the object of serious thinking; yea, the occasion of humbling ourselves. If something separates me from a brother, this is a sign that probably my relationship to Christ is not exactly what it should be. At least this is the very first point which needs to be tested, just as a man who cannot reach another party by phone checks first of all whether his connection with his own exchange is in order.

Notice how Paul handles the situation in Corinth. There were divisions there on personal grounds. Now Paul does not say to his readers:

"Let all of you give me your allegiance, since I am the founder of your Church," nor: "Give it to Cephas, the prince of the Apostles." He does not even say: "Your divisions are out of order, since Cephas, Apollos, and myself are fully agreed together." Rather, he invites the Corinthians to look to Christ, even Christ crucified, and to Him only. When all shall have this attitude, the question of their divisions shall be settled without further ado. It can be useful, in order to reestablish harmony with a brother, to go to him and to make a clean breast of things with him. But what is above all helpful in such cases is to come back all over again to Jesus, in order to strengthen the ties between Him and us. Thus our divisions are first of all a call to humiliation before the Lord and an invitation to attach ourselves more intimately to His name.

C. *Christian unity has God Himself as its author.*

We should not forget that Jesus was facing a very concrete situation. The Apostles were often disunited. They were spending time quarrelling as to who was the greatest. Even in the upper room they saw fit to pursue their discussions on this score (Luke 22: 24). In order to remedy the situation our Lord does not have recourse to exhortations. He does not say: "Stop quarrelling, be united; make a common front against the hostile world." Rather He prays. For the realization of Christian unity He does not look to human efforts, but to the Father's intervention. Of course, Christians have certain duties in this respect. Jesus commands them to love one another (John 13: 34). To counter their ambition, the source of the conflicts, He tells them to become servants of one another (Luke 22: 25-27). Elsewhere we are confronted with the duties of mutual forgiveness (Col. 3: 13), and of keeping the unity of the Spirit (Eph. 4: 3). We are not purely passive beings, devoid of responsibility.

Nevertheless, Christian unity shall never be the work of men. It is the work of God. It is always somewhat galling to hear people repeating, with good intentions to be sure, that it behooves us to answer the prayer of our Lord. What Jesus requested of the Father, the Father, and no one else, will give to Him. It is therefore not men's prerogative to establish Christian unity. It is grace which comes from God. We cannot attain unto it through our efforts—by dint of discussions, concessions, and conversations! We must place ourselves on the same plane as our Lord: prayer. Then, sometimes in the most unexpected ways, we will experience the joy of fraternal unity. Then we will receive it as grace bestowed by the Father in answer to the Son's request.

Unity achieved by human efforts is always in danger, of being contrary to the revealed will of God. In fact, it rarely avoids this danger. Let

us remember that, according to Christ's prayer, God alone is the author of true unity. Let us request it of Him with fervor, asking that He may grant it when and how He pleases. Let us place ourselves at His disposal in an attitude of submission to His will. And we shall see, many times with joy and occasionally with surprise, the answer to the Master's prayer. This is God's appointed way until the day on which Christ shall come again, when, visibly at last, there will be only one flock and one Shepherd.

(*to be concluded*)

A REPLY TO "THE GOSPEL SONG — GOOD OR BAD?"

JOHN BEAUREGARD

Dear Sir:

R. Rice Nutting's recent article (Vol. II, No. 1, Feb., 1956) on the gospel song is replete with questionable material.

It is surprising to read such an article and discover that either the author is destitute of a careful definition of the gospel song or he conceals it from his readers. What he means by the gospel song and how he distinguishes it from the Christian hymn is difficult to discern. On p. 9 he speaks of the gospel hymn but fails to say if this is synonymous with the gospel song. On p. 10 he speaks of Isaac Watts' hymns. Are they gospel songs or not? How does the folk hymn differ from the gospel song (p. 11)? Are all gospel songs truly folk music? On p. 14 the gospel chorus is brought under attack without relating it to the discussion of the gospel song.

The main thrust of Mr. Nutting's argument seems to rest on the lowly origin of the gospel song. Such an argument may be questioned. When propounded it requires considerable caution. This was the argument of Celsus against the early Christians. The argument was rather clearly answered both by Origen and by history. Klausner's *Life of Jesus* follows the same pattern. Because Christianity had a lowly origin and because it was spread by poor fishermen it is an unacceptable religion. The Talmud uses the same argument.

Let us apply this method in two instances. First, the same words employed by Paul to preach the Gospel were formulated, in many instances, in the heathen Greek culture before the time of Christ by lowly, unregenerate folk. Thus we conclude that Paul could not use the Greek language effectively to preach the Gospel because of its lowly origin.

Second, the New Testament was not written in the fine and careful classical Greek of the day but in the language of the people, called Koine. In some sections of the New Testament the style is less polished than in

other sections (II Peter vs. I Peter). May we conclude then that God should have limited Himself to the classical Greek? Does the fact that some New Testament books are in a less perfected style prove that they cannot be inspired books and cannot be useful for the development of Christian character? Is the style too poor for God to be associated with it, or for Him to use it? Certainly not!

There seems to be a tendency on the part of Prof. Nutting to divorce music from words and intended meaning. It is doubtful whether such is proper. On this reasoning one might also question the propriety of listening to the preaching of the Gospel in a place where secular events take place. We think of such places as Madison Square Garden, the Acropolis, or Mars Hill. Certainly God is not limited to classical music as a vehicle of expression for the devotion of His people.

It may be admitted that the main problem is one of the emphasis placed on various types of music. But Prof. Nutting only alludes to it in passing. If we were more sure of what he means by the gospel song, we might readily agree when he says it is "assuming an importance out of all proportion to its quality" (p. 12). However, if the whole gospel song approach is wrong, how can some gospel songs be good, as he contends on p. 16?

We await in vain the clarification of the problem and the methodology for determining proper and improper Christian music, although this is the announced purpose of the article (p. 9, 13).

Further, in the light of the Scriptural representations of human love and the figure of the church as the bride of Christ (Rev. 21: 2, 9), it is difficult to understand Mr. Nutting's reference to sensuous emotion in the chorus under attack on p. 14. Is human love no more than sensuality? Is it not an illustration of divine love? We would do well to read again of David's love for Jonathan or Paul's admonitions in I Corinthians 7 and Ephesians 5.

On p. 15 it may be questioned whether "evangelical Christians accept with complete favor" such music as is heard on the juke box, radio, etc. On p. 11 we wonder if this is not a caricature of the revival movement rather than a careful evaluation of the main fruit of its work. Have others than the Salvation Army and evangelists perpetuated the work of D. L. Moody and his colleagues (p. 12)? On p. 14 Mr. Nutting attempts to undercut the power of the gospel song by citing the people influenced by it. This is precarious (see above) for the poor and lowly were first influenced by the preaching of the Gospel in the early centuries. Christ's disciples were not well educated men, but this does not destroy the value of the Gospel or its power to transform the lives of even the mighty.

It is to be remembered that preaching itself, though ordained of God for the spread of the Gospel, was looked upon with disfavor in the time of Paul. If a man wanted to spread his teachings he did not preach but wrote and taught privately. Preaching was the approach to the crowd and used for mass reaction, it was seldom personal.

We might ask Mr. Nutting whether musical literacy is as important as the individual's response to the gospel of Christ? Which was the main task of those who wrote the gospel songs? Which is the main task of the Church of Christ today?

It seems rather likely that musical literacy is an aesthetic ability which is developed and not enforced. Aesthetic values are not rigidly fixed since classical music is often repulsive to a person when heard for the first time. The enjoyment of good music must grow on one. When he has learned to enjoy it he must be careful not to sit in judgment upon those who have not so succeeded. Another person may enjoy with equal feeling a production of much less technical skill.

If Mr. Nutting wishes to attack the gospel song he would do well to define his subject carefully and choose another line of attack.

Yours sincerely in Christ,

John Beauregard

PERSONALIA

William Nigel Kerr, Th.D., Ph.D., is Associate Professor of Church History at Gordon Divinity School. See "Personalia" Vol. I, No. 4, December, 1955, p. 152.

Gordon H. Clark, Ph.D., is head of the philosophy department at Butler University, Indianapolis, Indiana. See "Personalia," Vol. II, No. 1, February, 1956, p. 33.

Jules Marcel Nicole, M.A., S.T.M., is Co-director of the Institut Biblique of Nogent/Marne, France. See "Personalia," Vol. II, No. 2, May, 1956, p. 75.

Leonard C. Vander Linde, Jr., is a clinical psychologist on the staff of the Veterans Administration Mental Hygiene Clinic, Boston, Mass. Dr. Vander Linde received the A.B. from Calvin College, Grand Rapids, Michigan and the M.A. and Ph.D. from Boston University. The graduate degrees were in the field of clinical psychology. His three year internship was spent at the Cushing Veterans Administration Hospital and the Veterans Administration Clinic in Boston.

The subject of the doctoral dissertation was "Management of Hostility in Adult Males with Migraine Headaches." Dr. Vander Linde's research areas have been related to psychosomatic problems; e.g., psycho-physiological

responses to varying life conditions related to specific sympton disorder groups such as asthma, hay fever, ulcer, colitis, arthritis, skin diseases, etc.

Dr. Vander Linde is a member of the following organizations: American, Eastern, and Massachusetts Psychological Associations, and the Calvinist Guild of Scholars.

John Beauregard, B.D., is a graduate of Gordon Divinity School.

REVIEWS OF BOOKS

Modern Canterbury Pilgrims, and Why They Chose the Episcopal Church, edited by James A. Pike. New York: Morehouse-Gorham Co., 1956. 317pp. $3.85.

Twenty-three contemporary men and women, leaders in the scientific, academic, religious, labor, psychiatric, and literary worlds, here trace the steps which led them to the Anglican Communion. "There are a number of different roads into Canterbury." Some of the pilgrims represented in this volume approach it from Roman Catholicism (two of them former Roman priests), several from agnosticism. Some were formerly ministers or laymen in other Protestant denominations, both Liberal and Fundamentalist; one was by family background a Jew, another a Hindu.

It is most interesting to observe the many landmarks which these divers roads have in common. By the time one has finished the book, the countryside around Canterbury, by whatever direction one approaches it, has become familiar. Many of the writers join in recognizing explicitly that their pilgrimage has been led by a Providence in a way they would not have foreseen or chosen. Some, after recounting the intellectual adventures which led them to the Church, make it quite clear that their choice of the Episcopal Church (for most of the writers are Americans) was a fulfillment not wholly of intellectual needs but of much deeper personal ones.

Thus the beauty of the Anglican worship plays a large part in these testimonies. In the words of Enrico C. S. Molnar, "The artist in me likes to worship God in a meaningful 'beauty of holiness'" (214). Closely connected with this is the sense of dignity accorded to God's material creation by the Anglican's sacramentalism — stressing, as poet W. H. Auden puts it, "the physical reality of the flesh into which the Word was made" (42).

Part of the satisfaction in Episcopal worship arises from the sense of *common* prayer (96) — of the community of believers which constitutes the Church. Time and again the writers express a conviction that Anglicanism comes the closest to the true primitive conception of the Church in its methods and functions.

Then there is the feeling of security which arises from a confidence in the long-standing traditions of Anglicanism. "I believe in the holy catholic Church;" and repeatedly the essayists of this book assert that the Episcopal is the most catholic of churches, the truest to the original traditions of the whole body of Christ.

Alongside its faithfulness to basic Christian theological tradition, "the breath-taking scope and inclusiveness of Anglican orthodoxy" (139) is frequently referred to as an evidence of its catholicity. The constant repetition of this point is one of the most striking features of the book. Perhaps the present volume itself is the best proof of the ability of Anglicanism to unite in harmonious fellowship and cooperation representatives of widely divergent theological opinions. For the fact that all these pilgrims reached a common destination in Canterbury does not mean that they all arrived at exactly the same point. Some of them are the "highest" of "high" Churchmen. Others represent the "low" group, still others the "broad." And editor James A. Pike, Dean of the Cathedral of St. John the Divine in New York, explains how these three groups can dwell together under the same roof — which has often baffled non-Anglicans — when he says that the Anglican Church is thoroughly Catholic in the best sense, *and* thoroughly Protestant in the best sense, *and* thoroughly liberal in the best sense (311ff.).

On the whole, Fundamentalism receives very fair treatment at the hands of these essayists. In one or two places reference is made to its "intellectual obscurantism," by which they probably mean something quite different, for leaders of Fundamentalism, far from being intellectually obscurantist, devote a great deal of energy to the rational systematization and defense of the faith. But Fundamentalists do not have the same optimism about human reason that Liberals have, and quite a number of years ago it became fashionable to use the slightly charged and inaccurate phrase "intellectually obscurantist" to indicate this. The phrase now remains as a vestige of such outdated fashions in persons whose basic understanding of Fundamentalism was formed under their influence. However, in the main writers treat Fundamentalism fairly, and if they are not backward in criticizing the movement, neither do they spare Liberalism.

Along with the inclusiveness of the Anglican Communion, a very refreshing theme of this book is the continuing need of the Church for reformation (as opposed to the Roman view of static infallibility). More than one author thinks of the Anglican Church not as one reformed but as one *in reformation.* It would seem that such an attitude has to be held, either explicitly or subconsciously, in order to provide any incentive for creative Christian scholarship anywhere in Christendom. It is a very valuable

thing to have cultivated an appreciation of "the dynamic tension of dissent essential to growth" (72).

In a book of such sustained excellence, it is hard to pick out one or two essays as "the best." The one probably commanding most interest for readers of the *Review,* however, is that by Samuel J. Wylie, Chaplain for College Work of the Diocese of Rhode Island, who graduated from Wheaton College and served as a "conservative Presbyterian" (his own term) minister for eight years before entering the Episcopal ministry. The words with which he begins his essay are fitting ones to close this review:

> Pilgrims to Canterbury from other Christian traditions may journey far, but they find on arrival a surprising familiarity about the place. In one sense they never left home. Many truths that nurtured them in their former fellowships are equally honored here. No man is asked to surrender vital past experience. Anglicanism involves its converts in affirming much that they formerly may have denied. It requires denial only of the exclusiveness that limits truth to the insights of one century, one world view, or one social tradition.

—*Charles A. Huttar*

Sovereign Grace Book Club, 413 S. E. First St., Evansville, Indiana.

It is not often in our day that we discover first-rate devotional literature being published. It is much less often that we find an individual sufficiently exercised to do something concrete about it. However, in this book club we come upon a notable exception. The editor of this series has taken upon himself the publication of a number of the writings of certain among the great Puritan leaders. The particular value lies in the fact that this literature is very difficult to obtain today. Now any reader desirous of plumbing the deep wells of comfort and contemplation from another age may do so at small expense and effort and in a format which well suits the high value of the material.

Among the titles available are: *The Mute Christian Under the Smarting Rod,* by Thomas Brooks; *The Saint's Everlasting Rest,* by Richard Baxter; *Exposition of the Epistle to the Romans,* by Robert Haldane; *Songs of Sovereignty,* by John Owen; *Keeping the Heart,* by John Flavel; *Prayer,* by John Bunyan; and *Return of Prayers,* by Thomas Goodwin. Other writers to be included in future include Horatius Bonar, John Brown, Jonathan Edwards, Alexander Carson, and Thomas Manton. To make acquaintance with such is to find lasting friendship.

Further details of membership may be obtained from the young man, whose vision this club is, Jay Green, at the above address. We may paraphrase Whitman in saying, "These are no books. Who touches them touches a man."

—*Thomas H. Leith*

The Defense of the Faith, by Cornelius Van Til. Philadelphia: The Presbyterian and Reformed Publishing Company, 1955. 436 pp. $4.95.
Christianity and Idealism, as above. $1.50.

There is little doubt that the author of these volumes is the most controversial flower in the present blossoming of philosophical theology within American Conservatism. He has attacked, and in turn been attacked by, not only those of different persuasion in dogma but also by many within his own Reformed tradition. Yet all this has occurred with relatively little formal publication on his part. The major sources of his thought lie in the syllabi used in his courses at the Westminster Theological Seminary; which syllabi have apparently wandered no little. It is a perhaps unfortunate need that the first title, a major work in apologetics, should be forced into the mould of a reply to criticism rather than into a neatly developed system introducing the mature thought of this scholar to the general public, often familiar only with his notable *The New Modernism.*

In the preface he tells us that he seeks "to set forth in a positive fashion what seems to the writer to be the Biblical method of defending the Christian Faith . . . . In the second place this work deals with contemporary objections which have been made against the writer's views of apologetics." Thus he divides the book into two parts, the first on the structure of his thought and the second on objections to it; but, there is considerable overlapping of tasks. Orientation for the second part is best obtained by perusal of *Calvin Forum* articles during the last several years; the first part is basically the discussion of his syllabi. The first section has chapters on the subject to be defended, metaphysical presuppositions, the roots of Christian epistemology, the problem of contact with the unbeliever in his ethical perversity, and on Reformed apologetics and common grace. The waters here are swift and deep, but the need to master the current seems imperative to any thinking Christian. Whether Van Til has found the only landing place on the other shore must be decided by the reader after careful thought. No review of this nature can hope to chart easily the author's way.

The second part deals in detail with the writings of recent critics and here the philosophically and theologically inclined will find much to ponder long. Perhaps one will wonder if the difficulties are not parochial and hence not always for him, but the reviewer would suggest that they are as broad as Christendom and demand orientation to whatever our denominational preference may be. With the writings of Amsterdam thinkers becoming available and with the works of the Hodges, Warfield, Machen, Orr, Clark, Henry, and Carnell, among others in the Reformed fold, at hand we can now see the many facets (which Van Til might at times call flaws)

of profound thought which the Calvinistic tradition has presented to the world of Conservative theology and philosophy. This tradition cannot be neglected and Van Til's major contribution may lie largely in stirring up attention to it.

Christianity and Idealism is in a somewhat different vein. Largely dealing with the relationship of Idealism to Christianity, it seeks to point out that the current utilization of the former philosophy by Conservative apologetes leads "inevitably toward pragmatism." To the end of making this clear, Van Til does not attack the question directly but rather collects a number of articles and reviews on Idealistic writings the criticisms in which are to be applied by analogy in Conservative circles. Kant, Knudson, Trueblood, Reinhold Niebuhr, A. A. Bowman, J. Thomas, A. E. Taylor, Bosanquet, Royce, Bradley, Pringle-Pattison, Hocking and others pass in review. For the student this is a useful series of essays.

—*Thomas H. Leith*

The Flood and Noah's Ark, by André Parrot. New York: Philosophical Library, 1955. 76 pp., illus. $2.75.

The Tower of Babel, by André Parrot. New York: Philosophical Library. 1955. 75 pp., illus. $2.75.

St. Paul's Journeys in the Greek Orient, by Henri Metzger. New York: Philosophical Library, 1955. 75 pp., illus. $2.75.

With these three volumes are presented numbers 1, 2 and 4 of the series, *Studies in Biblical Archeology,* which was introduced by *Discovering Buried Worlds.*. All of these brief monographs are excellently and authoritatively written, with a surprising amount of pertinent information included within a few pages. The theories and conclusions of the authors may not be acceptable to the readers; indeed, it is freely admitted that they are not all in accord with general scholarly opinion. But the archeological facts are clearly and helpfully presented.

In *The Flood and Noah's Ark,* Dr. Parrot frankly believes the Flood to be simply a momentous local deluge of which the Biblical story is one of several more or less lengendary remembrances. The value of the book lies in the marshalling of the various ancient flood stories and the archeological evidence of floods in the Mesopotamian area which some have been quick to take as evidence of the Biblical account. There is also a section dealing with ancient boats and giving the facts behind the claims of "finding Noah's Ark" that appear from time to time in the popular press.

The Tower of Babel in the Bible, according to Parrot, is a Hebrew legend invented to account for the ruined ziggurats with which the Israelites were familiar. Few will agree with this conclusion, but again we have a fascinating study of archeological data, the ziggurats, the Babylonian cathedrals. Dr. Parret contends that since the ziggurats were for the worship, not the defiance of God, the Biblical story must be wrong. He fails to reckon with the fact that man's greatest acts of defiance and pride have often been in the worship of those who have exchanged the "truth of God for a lie."

Henri Metzger's book is devoted to giving the background, geographically, historically, and culturally of the places and peoples among whom Paul preached the Gospel. This is a delightful little book, not a tedious listing of archeological discoveries, but a vivid recreation of the Greek Orient of the first century A.D.

—Philip C. Johnson

The Prophets — Pioneers to Christianity, by Walter G. Williams. Nashville: Abingdon Press, 1956. 223pp. $3.50.

Dr. Williams is professor of Old Testament literature at the Iliff School of Theology. He is a well known author and lecturer and a recognized Biblical scholar. In this recent book which is subtitled, *The Relevance of the Prophets for Christians Today,* his purpose is "to seek to retrace the steps by which man has arrived at some of his greatest convictions, particularly those convictions that later became basic in Christianity" (34). Part One deals with "Records of the Journey." A brief summary indicates how new sources of knowledge have made it possible to have a clearer understanding of the Old Testament. Part Two, "The Procession of Majestic Thinking," has to do with the development of man's knowledge and understanding of God as revealed in Scripture. Part Three deals with the outstanding prophets, Amos, Hosea, Isaiah, Jeremiah, Ezekiel, who have "Blazed the Trail." The book is well and clearly written and Part Three shows real insight into the problems and struggles of the prophets. The chapter on Hosea is a very good exposition of the problem and importance of Hosea's marriage.

As one reads this book, however, he becomes aware of a great familiarity. One realizes that this book has been written and rewritten over and over again by a number of men during the last half century. It is one more iteration of the outworn old shade of Wellhausen, repeating with little change the same unsatisfactory theories with the same attitude of scorn for any who would disagree. Here is the naturalism that considers the Bible as simply a record of man's intellectual achievements in the field of morals and ethics, in no sense a revelation. There is the same old concept of religious

development from polytheism to monotheism, from magic to theology, from fear to true worship which the contrary evidence of anthropology and archeology should long since have dissipated. The foundations of the old theories have been thoroughly demolished, and men such as Wright, Albright and even Cyrus Gordon are rewriting the theology and history of Israel in a form far closer to the Biblical story. Dr. Williams, for all the excellencies of the book and the wide scholarly knowledge it evidences, is still in the grasp of the nineteenth century.

—Philip C. Johnson

The American Catholic Family, by John L. Thomas, S. J. Englewood Cliffs: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1956. 471 pp. $5.75.

Primarily addressed to social workers and the Roman Catholic clergy, this book will profit also Protestant ministers, school teachers, parents, and public-spirited citizens. If Aristotle were right that "All men by nature desire to know," the body of readers would be as wide as humanity, for this is a book for all who want to know the truth about home life, whether among Roman Catholics or others. The fact is that not all men desire to know the things Aristotle desired to know, neither do all men desire to know what is disclosed in this book regarding family life.

The discussion of American Roman Catholic family life is complete; the conclusions meticulously argued, though admittedly on regrettably incomplete data. The author regards it as a preliminary and tentative study. As such, it is a massive affair of 471 large pages with careful documentation. One does not have to infer the author's competence: the book itself modestly exhibits evidence for confidence in his scholarship. There is a great deal of repetition, but this does not become tiresome for it is the mark of a teacher skilled in pedagogy. The reader can hardly fail to get the point. Moreover, the repetition is useful when one uses the book for reference on specific topics.

There is no *imprimatur* or *nihil obstat* of the Roman hierarchy, hence one cannot cite its contents as official Roman Catholic pronouncements, except for quotations from papal encyclicals (subject to the question whether the English translations given are official).

What is the book? First, a survey of the position of the Roman Catholic family in American society. Second, the Roman Catholic concept of marriage and the attitude of the church. Third, the characteristics of Roman Catholic families of various origins. Fourth, family breakdown as it affects Roman Catholics. Fifth, "programs for survival:" what the Roman Catholic Church is doing about its family problems.

Certain assumptions in the book invite challenge. I have placed "Roman" before every mention of "Catholic," because the author's assumption is that the Roman Church is all the Catholic Church there is. For the sake of argument admitting, if not granting, that the Roman Catholic Church is catholic, a great many Protestants would also consider themselves catholic in that they believe the doctrines contained in the most ancient creeds: Apostolic, Nicene, Athanasian. Whatever else they may believe, they intend to hold all that is necessary and universal in Christianity. If the specifically Roman dogmas and practices which are not found in the New Testament, do not derogate from the Roman church's right to be called catholic, then neither do the peculiarities of Protestant denominations. The only question in either case is, are our idiosyncracies consistent with the universal faith of the body of Christ?

I would like to quote with approval two sentences from the book under review: "Religion is something more than knowledge; it is knowledge plus habit and practice. It is understanding life and living life in terms of the supernatural (389).

It is not only in creed that the Catholic Church is wider than the Roman. We who make up that wider group have many moral standards in common. We all mold our conception of the family on the specific teaching of Jesus Christ.. The Christian family is an indissoluble unit. In one of his sonnets, Shakespeare says:

> Let me not to the marriage of true minds
> Admit impediments. Love is not love
> Which alters where it alteration finds,
> Or bends with the remover to remove.
> Oh, no, it is an ever-fixed mark
> Which looks on tempests and is never shaken:
> It is the star to every wandering bark,
> Whose worth's unknown, although his height be taken.
> Love's not Time's fool, though rosy lips and cheeks
> Within his bending sickle's compass come.
> Love bears it out even to the edge of doom (Sonnet CXVI).

Where there has been a weakening among us of this ideal, it is due to the same pressures of which Roman Catholics complain. Denominations and individuals have departed from the norm in varying modes and degrees. Even in apostolic days some departed "having loved this present world." Some "went out, because they were not of us, for if they had been of us, they would have continued with us."

The author constantly emphasizes the role of Roman Catholics as a minority in America, with a "subsystem" of values and social practices. To some of us the Roman Catholic population seems such a large minority as hardly to partake of the desperate plight of small minorities. In many

cities and towns it is an overwhelming majority. In many others, if Roman Catholics would work with Protestants likeminded in regard to family ideals, we would be a majority, and could together speak with a clear and compelling voice to the public conscience. For while we would welcome modification of certain Roman Catholic dogmas relating to the church and other matters, we should only regret any weakening of Roman Catholic ideals of marriage. Even rejecting the term "sacrament," we do not repudiate the sacred character of the bond.

Moreover, others cannot be "dominant" over us in matters of religion and morals, unless we let them. The early Christians in the Roman empire conquered by faith working through love.

The authoritarian position of the Roman Church on the "only true Church" would seem to be the impassable barrier. This comes out in the constant assertion that only marriage before a Roman priest (and not all of them) is a valid marriage. It is distinctly stated that marriage before a Protestant minister is invalid. This is, of course, intolerable. It seems to me also inconsistent with the position that the Roman sacrament of marriage is made by the parties, and that the priest is present only as a witness thereto.

The author complains of the neutrality of the public school with regard to religion and family ideals, neglecting to mention that it is largely the protests of Roman Catholics which have compelled the public school to become religiously neutral. True, atheists and certain fringe sects have taken a hand in the protests, yet the backbone of the opposition to any mention of religion has been the large number of Roman Catholics.. Their unholy if unacknowledged alliance with atheists and certain peculiar religious sects in this is at least unfortunate. Roman Catholic and Evangelical Christians ought to be uniting to promote such measures as the reading in public schools of any honest translation of at least the New Testament and those portions of the Old admitted by all to be canonical, and the use of the Lord's prayer — with the doxology omitted if this will satisfy Roman views of textual criticism. Among those honest translations stand the Confraternity New Testament, and that by Msgr. Ronald Knox (his Old Testament would perhaps be subject to reservations, because of its exotic literacy character, not from a doctrinal standpoint).

A remark of the author with regard to organizations to promote specific social objectives would seem to apply to the perils faced by all religious denominational organizations, including the Roman hierarchy itself:

> With the passage of time, social movements tend to harden into a bureaucratic structure dominated by "vested interests." Under these conditions, the organization tends to become an end in itself so that its prepetuation becomes more important than the needs which it was originally established to meet (427).

I close this review with the expression of an ardent longing for even the most modest breaking down of the middte wall of partition, so that we Christians on either side could at least look one another in the face and have sincere, earnest, heart-searching fellowship together in the presence of our common Lord. I sorrow when any man, Protestant or Catholic, refuses to kneel with me at the Mercy Seat of Jesus Christ.

Get this book (or ask your public library to get it) and find out what the family next door is doing. They have their troubles too. Maybe, at least on the neighborhood level, we could help one another to make our homes what we all know Christ meant them to be.

—*Emmet Russell*

Education for Christian Living, by Randolph Crump Miller. New York: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 418 pp. $8.65.

From the plastic grey jacket to the last item of an adequate index we have here an admirable book.

First, it is orderly. It begins and ends with theology which every volume on Christian education should. The scope "ranges from the philosophical and historical to the practical." The thesis begun in a former volume, *Clue to Christian Education,* is here continued, that theology is prior to all Christian education both in philosophy and in method. The four sections of the book are arranged and subdivided in an orderly fashion.

Second, the language is direct. "The purpose of this book is to lead all interested persons into an understanding of the theory, techniques, and administration of Christian education" (p. 4). There is no evasiveness about the viewpoint established or an attempt to win readers through some vapid neutrality. "Christian education involves a point of view, for it is a particular kind of education. It is not secular education with a halo . . . . [It] is concerned with the relevance of revealed Christian truth. Theology . . . . is the determining factor in the development of a philosophy of education . . . . techniques . . . . goals . . . . and of the nature of the learners to be taught" (p. 5).

Third, the book is built upon a theological foundation. "Christian theology is the primary source of Christian education theory and procedure" (p. 71). "The final check on the program is a theological one. Theology is the source of the curriculum. Much has passed for Christian education that has been respectable moral training, or indoctrination in theological tenets, or knowledge of Biblical facts. But the task of Christian education is to work through the institution of the church to incorporate boys and girls, men and women, into the redemptive and sustaining community that is the true church of which Jesus Christ is the foundation" (pp. 368, 369).

In his theological starting point, the author stands with other Neo-orthodox writers of our day. These men are not looked upon with appreciation by the old-line liberals in Christian education. Dr. Miller defines and illustrates Biblical theology. However, although the theology of his communion is orthodox, being based upon the Thirty-Nine Articles, the writer's interpretation of it is clearly Neo-orthodox.

In the fourth place, the Yale professor does not shun difficult tasks. In the chapter, "Religious Education and the Schools," he not only sees the problems, but is fair and frank to estimate the various solutions which have been forwarded. It is surprising that in this same chapter the possibility of Christian day schools is dismissed in eleven and a half lines. Surprising, because the Episcopal Church has established some notable Christian schools. More surprising, because they alone can integrate subject matter and Christian truth in the way the author considers essential for real Christian education.

One of the high spots in the book is the chapter, "Methods of Worship." So much sanctified common sense could only come from a father of six children who writes from the compulsion of a twenty-four hour a day laboratory experience in Christian education. The section on hymns should be read by every person who leads a service in the local church from the pastor to the nursery superintendent.

For teachers, the most practical section of the book is the third, "Methods in Religious Education." This contains many valuable suggestions for the experienced teacher as well as the neophyte. An excellent chapter utilizes Dale's 'cone of experience' for bringing audio-visual aids to the local church where and when they aid. Pastors, directors, and offices will find the fourth section of the book to their special liking. Every parish committee on Christian education should have this book as compulsory reading. Dr. Miller writes, "The program of Christian education should be an integrated one . . . . This element of *integration* [italics his] is of the greatest significance" (p. 360). Much wasted time and effort could be saved in the average church if more emphasis were put on integration of the parish program of Christian education.

Students will appreciate the two concluding sections. First, "A Basic Bibliography" of seven pages lists fifty volumes under twelve divisions which coincide with the basic theses of the book. Not the least interesting here is the author's concise, usually one sentence, summary of each book. Second, "For More Information" contains twenty-six small-print pages crammed with additional bibliographical material. This valuable information follows the chapter titles and numbers of the body of the book. In other words, after

reading a chapter, the reader may turn to this section and find the author's evaluation of most of the other pertinent information in that particular area. It is at this point that Dr. Miller shows a vast erudition in his field. He not only knows the books, but gives his opinion as to their best uses.

Conservatives will wish that the author were more orthodox than neo-orthodox, but will appreciate his breadth of knowledge in the field which shows itself by quotations all the way from John Calvin to John Dewey.

The book is beautifully printed and easy to read. The latter is especially true because the footnotes are at the bottom of each page! It will be an excellent text for any one of several courses in the department of Christian education in college or seminary. One omission puzzles. There is not a single mention of Theodore Brameld and 'Reconstructionism'. This latest peril in the field of education should not be ignored.

— *Charles G. Schauffele*

Protestant Nurture, by Harry C. Munro. New York: Prentice-Hall, Inc. 270 pp. $5.00.

The Executive Secretary of the Fort Worth Area Council of Churches has given us ten highly provocative chapters under the heading of *Protestant Nurture.* From a rich background of variety in education, teaching, writing, missionary and pastoral work, the retired Professor of Brite College of the Bible at Texas Christian University has raised questions in this book which are not easily answered. In fact, the methodology of the book itself is question-raising. Each chapter is subdivided into sections which are always headed by a question to be discussed. And, Dr. Munro does not claim to have the only answers to the questions.

The definition of the title is given thus: "True Protestant nurture consists in the sharing of spiritual experiences on the part of free, growing persons, with never an attempt to impose one upon the other or to bring some into spiritual submission to others. Leaders and learners are alike in that they are all freely experiencing and growing together. The difference between them is that the leaders have a larger and richer experience to share, and know both the resources and the methods for the most effective sharing of human experience, both contemporary and historic" (p. 49).

Protestant nurture is to be carried on within the framework of democratic education. "The philosopher-prophet of this creative type of education in America has been John Dewey" (p. 49). "The Philosophy of John Dewey is the dominant, single influence in American education, and the conception of education which we have briefly described is the American

ideal, however short of it our practice may fall" (p. 52). Dr. Munro is advocating a philosophy and methodology based upon the creative work of Dewey, Thorndike and Kilpatrick for both general education and religious education. This will avoid the dualism which the American child in public school is now subjected to when he receives liberating and scientifically organized education in his day school but traditional, transmissive indoctrination in his Sunday School.

To ascertain the author's theological assumptions, there are several indicators. "Perhaps no one has interpreted Christianity more clearly for the modern mind than Dr. Harry Emerson Fosdick" (p. 18). This is followed by a lengthy quotation from "As I See Religion" by Fosdick. There are eight quotations from Dr. George Albert Coe. Christian Education "is the systematic critical examination and reconstruction of relations between persons, guided by Jesus' assumption that persons are of infinite worth, and by the hypothesis of the existence of God, the Great Valuer of Persons" (p. 24). Under the basic doctrines of Protestantism, the author names: justificaion by faith, every Christian his own priest, the right of private judgment, and the authority of Christ mediated through the Bible. However, he warns against carrying over the medieval doctrines of "verbal inspiration" and "inerrancy" from which have emanated many evils in Protestantism (p. 34)

The ever thorny problem of religion in education is treated in the chapter on "The American Way of Education". The various past solutions are discussed: Sunday School, weekday religious education, parochial schools, vacation schools, and the family. "It is clear that much of the solution of our American educational problem is up to the churches" (p. 238).

Chapter 10, "The Growing Edges of the Movement," is an evaluation of the present developments in the field of Protestant nurture. These are defined as an increasing emphasis on family life in the church and community, and a growing movement in adult education.

The author, one year beyond retirement, is writing from two positions almost passé. His viewpoint of liberalism in theology has been superseded largely by neo-orthodoxy. The names of Barth, Brunner, Niebuhr or the term "neo-orthodoxy" do not appear in this volume. Paul Tillich is quoted once from a secondary source. In the field of education, Deweyism has passed its zenith. Munro gives no recognition to its successor, Reconstructionism.

— Charles G. Schauffele

SURVEY OF SIGNIFICANT ARTICLES

THOMAS H. LEITH

Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science, July. An issue on Africa and the Western World.

Proceedings of the American Philosophical Society, June 28. "The Early Evolution of Land Vertebrates" by A. S. Romer.

American Scholar, Summer. Contains an article by G. Weigel, S. J. on "Catholic and Protestant Theologies in Outline."

Journal of the American Scientific Affiliation, March. Articles by W. R. Rusk and G. K. Schweitzer on modern cosmology and by I. W. Knobloch on the recapitulation theory in biology. The June issue has an article "The Christian Physician and 'Faith Healing'" by J. H. Rouch.

Anglican Theological Review, April. An editorial on "Theology and Christian Education."

Atlantic Monthly, May. Z. Chafee, Jr. contributes an article on the decline of civil rights.

Bulletin of the Atomic Scientists, April. Contains articles on technology and the future and on world politics and world government. The June issue has a number of interesting articles on science and social responsibility.

Behavioral Science, April. Part One of a discussion on "A Theory of the Structure of Value" by N. M. Smith, Jr.

Bibliotheca Sacra, April. A. J. McClain, "A Premillennial Philosophy of History." Also contains the first part of articles on Luther's theology by J. T. Mueller and on archaeology and Biblical criticism by J. P. Free, and part two of Merrill Unger's article on "The Significance for Biblical Studies of the New Manuscript Finds.."

British Journal for the Philosophy of Science, May. An issue dealing with psychoanalysis as a philosophy and a science.

Canadian Historical Review, June. R. M. Saunders, "Some Thoughts on the Study of History."

Canadian Journal of Theology, April. G. G. Harrop, "Some Negative Thinking on the Question of Peter's Roman Residence and Martyrdom" and K. H. Cousland, "The Roman Catholic Church and the State in Canada."

Catholic Biblical Quarterly, April. Continues the periodicals survey for 1955 as does the July issue. The latter has articles on the Dead Sea Scrolls and New Testament comparisons and on the Pentateuch problem.

Christian Graduate, June. C. H. Selby, "Modern Views of the Origin of Species" and B. G. Buxton, "The Missionary's Strategy and Equipment."

Christian Life, May. An article on the creation of man by J. O. Buswell, III.

Christian Scholar, June. An issue dealing with the Christian in the fields of philosophy and theology.

Church History, June. E. H. Emerson, "Calvin and Covenant Theology" and J. Pelikan, "Montanism and Its Trinitarian Significance."

Concordia Theological Monthly, May. G. A. Thiele, "The World Council of Churches." The July number has "Faith Without Works" by F. W. Danker.

Confluence, April. An excellent series on the international and national problems of atomic energy in its weapons, social, economic, and political aspects. This is continued in the July issue.

Current History, May. An issue dealing with Africa. The June issue is a report on the Middle East. "The Far East in the Free World" is discussed thoroughly in the July number.

Diogenes, Number 13. Contains articles by and on Arnold Toynbee dealing with his philosophy of history.

Education, July. F. Mayer, "The Aims of Education."

Eternity, May. Two articles on the pro's and con's of Christian College education. The June issue contains an article on church and race tension in South Africa. The July number has C. Stacey Woods on "Are the Bible Schools and Seminaries Doing the Job?" The August issue contains subsequent discussion. Harold Lindsell also contributes a discussion on "The Bible and Race Relations."

Expository Times, June and July. Articles on "Bultmann and the Liberal Theology."

Evangelical Quarterly, April-June. Articles on "Augustine and the Old Testament Canon" by S. J. Schultz and on "The Claim of Jesus Christ on Modern Education" by J. Chr. Coetzee.

Facts Forum, May. Contains an interesting discussion on "right-to-work Laws." A real ethical problem for the Christian.

Free University Quarterly, November, 1955. Articles on science and its limitations, Christian faith and science, and the limits of physics. Also an article by F. W. Grosheide, "Calvinistic Hermeneutics."

Harper's, July. P. F. Drucker has an article on the future increases in enrollment and cost for higher education.

Harvard Educational Review, Winter. I. Scheffler, "Science, Morals, and Educational Policy."

Hibbert Journal, July. W. E. Hocking, "Christianity and the Faith of the Coming World Civilization."

His, June. Articles by D. Feaver, "Taste in Christian Music," by K. S. Kantzer, "Barthianism," and by E. J. Young, "The Dead Sea Scrolls."

Humanist, July-August. Paul Blanshard, "Challenges to Religious Privilege" and P. Robertson, "On Getting Values out of Science."

International Review of Missions, July. S. G. Browne, "Medical Missions at the Crossroads."

Journal of Higher Education, May. Articles on "Opportunities in College Teaching" and "Is there a Scientific Method?"

Journal of Pastoral Care, Summer. R. L. Hudson, "Sin and Sickness" and R. L. Katz, "Should a Patient be Told the Seriousness of His Illness?"

Journal of Philosophy, May 24. "Truth in Art" by A. Sesonske.

Journal of Teacher Education, June. A very interesting discussion of a future problem in Christian and secular education—the using of nonprofessional teacher aides.

Main Currents in Modern Thought, May. U Nu on "Buddhism."

Middle Eastern Affairs, May. Articles on Soviet policy in the Middle East.

Nation, July 7. A discussion on the negro, the south, and the coming election.

National Review, June 13. Another article on "right-to-work laws" and the recent Supreme Court decision in that regard.

Nature, June 16. An editorial on "The Balance of Arts and Sciences in Education." The June 30 number has an editorial on academic freedom.

New Republic, June 11. An issue on Russia since Stalin. The June 16 issue has A. Schlesinger, Jr. criticizing the recent *Time* article on the intellectual.

Partisan Review, Spring. M. White writes on Reinhold Niebuhr and Walter Lippmann as critics of liberalism and secularism.

Pastoral Psychology, June. An issue on evangelism and pastoral psychology.

Philosophy of Science, April. R. Palter, "Philosophic Principles and Scientific Theory."

Political Science Quarterly, June. S. Kucherov, "The Soviet Union is Not a Socialist Society."

Reformed Journal, July-August. D. Jellema, "Opportunities for Scholarship" and E. H. Smith, "Nationalism and Christian Missions."

Reformed Review, April. A symposium on Christian schools versus secular education.

Religious Education, July-August. Symposia on "Religion and the Public Schools" and "Religion and Higher Education."

Religion in Life, Summer. An article on "Centrifugal Sects."

Review and Expositor, July. "Communism and Christian Ethics" by H. Barnette.

Review of Metaphysics, June. L. Mackey, "Kierkegaard and the Problem of Existential Philosophy" and R. N. Smart, "Being and the Bible."

Saturday Review, May 5. Articles commemorating Freud's centenary by Crane Brinton and L. S. Kubie. The June 9 issue has an article on the dangers of atomic radiation by H. J. Muller.

Science and Society, Spring. "Science and Human Welfare" by J. D. Bernal.

Theology Today, July. A symposium on the problems of training a minister.

Thomist, April. Article on the Immaculate Conception.

Torch and Trumpet, May. "Academic Freedom" by R. J. Rushdoony; "Artificial Insemination" by J. D. Hollander; and E. H. Palmer on state aid to Christian Education.

University of Toronto Quarterly, April. Has a lengthy and very fine survey of Canadian writing in all fields during the past year.

Transactions of the Victoria Institute, April 16. E. W. Crabb, "Philosophical Principles in the Teaching of Science and Religion." May 7 paper is by R. Hooykaas on "The Principle of Uniformity in Geology and Biology."

Westminster Theological Journal, May. "The Teacher of Righteousness and Jesus Christ" by E. J. Young.

World Dominion, July. G. Hewitt, "Modern Translations of the Bible."

NOTICE

Demand for the first issue of the *Gordon Review,* February, 1955, has far exceeded the supply. If there are those among our readers who are not keeping a file of this publication, it would be greatly appreciated if you would send in any such copies. If within travelling distance, let us know where we can pick them up.